

## Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts Office of Communications, 455 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102-3688 California Courts Infoline 800-900-5980, www.courts.ca.gov

**NEWS RELEASE** 

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE September 21, 2012 (S.C. 38/12)

Contact: Leanne Kozak, 916-263-2838

## Summary of Cases Accepted and Related Actions for Week of September 17, 2012

[This news release is issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has accepted and of their general subject matter. The statement of the issue or issues in each case set out below does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

#12-96 In re I.J., S204622. (B237271; 207 Cal.App.4th 1351; Los Angeles County Superior Court; CK59248.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order in a juvenile dependency proceeding. This case presents the following issue: Was the evidence that a 14-year-old girl had been sexually abused by her father sufficient in itself to support a juvenile court's jurisdictional findings under Welfare and Institutions Code, section 300, subdivisions (b), (d) or (j), that her younger male siblings were at substantial risk of future sexual abuse or other risk of harm?

#12-97 Iskanian v. CLS Transportation Los Angeles, LLC, S204032. (B235158; 206 Cal.App.4th 949; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC356521.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting a motion to compel arbitration and dismissing class claims. This case presents the following issues: (1) Did AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion (2011) 563 U.S. \_\_ [131 S. Ct. 1740, 179 L.Ed.2d 742] impliedly overrule Gentry v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal.4th 443 with respect to contractual class action waivers in the context of non-waivable labor law rights? (2) Does the high court's decision permit arbitration agreements to override the statutory right to bring representative claims under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Lab. Code, § 2698 et seq.)? (3) Did defendant waive its right to compel arbitration?

#12-98 County of Los Angeles v. Alternative Medicinal Cannabis Collective, S204663. (B233419; 207 Cal.App.4th 601; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC457089.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed the issuance of a preliminary injunction in a civil action.

#12-99 420 Caregivers, LLC v. City of Los Angeles, S204684. (B230436; 207 Cal.App.4th 703; Los Angeles County Superior Court; BC433942.) Petition for review

after the Court of Appeal reversed the issuance of a preliminary injunction in a civil action.

The court ordered briefing in *Alternative Medical Cannabis Collective* and *420 Caregivers* deferred pending decision in *City of Riverside v. Inland Empire Patient's Health & Wellness Center, Inc.*, S198638 (12-03), and *People v. G3 Holistic, Inc.*, S198395 (#12-04), which include issues concerning preemption, under federal or state law, of local ordinances regulating or banning the operation of medical marijuana dispensaries and related activities.

## **DISPOSITIONS**

Review in the following cases was dismissed in light of *In re Ethan C*. (2012) 54 Cal.4th 610.

```
#11-33 In re L.L., S190230. #11-34 In re L.L., S190245.
```

Review in the following case was dismissed:

#11-120 People v. Verni, S195717.